

REMARKS

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3, 7 and 9 are canceled hereby. Although the elements of claim 3 are incorporated into claim 1, these elements are amended in claim 1 to address the defects asserted by the Office Action.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0193680) in view of Catulle (U.S. Patent No. 3,673,674) and further in view of Watanabe (Japanese Patent No. 11101072A).

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the elements of claim 2 and the amended elements of claim 3. Applicant contends that amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from Wang in view of Catulle and further in view of Watanabe. In addition, Applicant contends that amended claim 1, now covering essentially the same subject matter as prior claim 3, is also patentably distinct from Wang in view of Catulle, in view of Watanabe and further in view of Kern as applied to claims 2-9 below. In particular, Applicant contends that the rejection must fail because the combined references do not teach or render obvious every element arranged as required by amended claim 1. *Cf.*, MPEP § 2131 (“The elements must be arranged as required by the claim . . .”) (internal citations omitted).

According to the technical solution of the currently amended claim 1, each of the two holes is formed at an edge of the side frame so that a groove can be formed between the two holes, which is used for receiving the side steel lining panel. That is, the side steel lining panel is provided in the groove formed between the two holes. In this configuration, the strength of the insertion assembly can be improved and the assembled insertion assembly is more compact and

stable as described in Paragraph 2, Page 3 of the Description. In contrast, the two holes disclosed in the primary reference of Wang are not formed at the edge of the side frame. Moreover, none of the cited references nor their combination teaches or renders obvious a groove formed between the two holes and used for receiving the side steel lining panel as recited in amended claim 1.

It is clear from the above that the configuration of the assembled insertion assembly in the amended claim 1 essentially differs from that in each of the cited references or their combination, and it is well-known for those skilled in the art that different configurations will result in different structural strengths. Moreover, one of the problems to be solved by Applicant's invention is to improve the strength of the insertion assembly.

From the above, it can be concluded that the currently amended claim 1 should be patentable over Wang in view of Catulle and further in view of Watanabe as presently applied against claim 1, as well as over Wang in view of Catulle, in view of Watanabe and further in view of Kern as presently applied against claims 2-9. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and allowance of claim 1.

Claims 2-9

Claims 2-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0193680) in view of Catulle (U.S. Patent No. 3,673,674), in view of Watanabe (Japanese Patent No. 11101072A), and further in view of Kern (U.S. Patent No. 3,828,516). Claims 2-3 and 6-9 are canceled hereby without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant contends that it has shown claim 1 to be patentably distinct from the cited references of Wang in view of Catulle, in view of Watanabe and further in view of Kern. As claims 4-5 include all patentable elements of claim 1, these claims are thus believed to be allowable for at the same reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and allowance of claims 4-5.

CONCLUSION

Claim 1 is amended herein. Claims 2-3 and 6-9 are canceled hereby. Claims 1, 4 and 5 are currently pending.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any further fees deemed necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501373.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2204.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 27 Apr 09



Thomas W. Leffert
Reg. No. 40,697

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze

Customer No. 27073

T 612 312 2200

F 612 312 2250